DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 182 473 CE 023 984

TITLE Dissemination and Use of Materials to Facilitate Locally Directed Evaluation of Community College Agricultural Occupations Programs. Phase III, July 1, 1976 through June 30, 1980.

INSTITUTION Illinois Univ., Urbana. Dept. of Vocational and Technical Education.

SPONS AGENCY Illinois State Office of Education, Springfield. Div. of Adult Vocational and Technical Education.

PUB DATE Nov 79

NOTE 72p.

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Agricultural Education: Check Lists: *Community Colleges: Educational Accountability: *Evaluation Criteria: Guidelines: *Program Evaluation; Program Planning: *Standards: *Vocational Agriculture

IDENTIFIERS *Illinois

ABSTRACT

This evaluation guide is designed to assist local community college instructors, administrators, and other persons in the evaluation of their agricultural occupations program. The first of three sections provides an introduction and discusses (1) how standards benefit students, colleges, and the community: (2) how to prepare for a review of the local program: (3) how to conduct the review; and (4) how to develop a plan for upgrading the local program. Section 2 contains an example showing how to use the standards checklist for reviewing local programs. This section also provides lists of standards approved by Illinois community college instructors in agriculture. The final section includes the following field test reports: horticulture program--Joliet Junior College; agricultural supply program--Illinois Central College; agricultural mechanics program--Lake Land College: and agricultural production program--Lewis and Clark College. (LRA)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED182473

DISSEMINATION AND USE OF MATERIALS TO FACILITATE LOCALLY DIRECTED EVALUATION OF COMMUNITY COLLEGE AGRICULTURAL OCCUPATIONS PROGRAMS

Donald F. Muirheid, Chairman
State Board of Education

Joseph M. Cronin
State Superintendent of Education

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

C. Reisinger

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education
Springfield, Illinois
November, 1979

CE 023 984

This project entitled, Dissemination and Use of Materials to Facilitate Locally Directed Evaluation of Community College Agricultural Occupations Programs, was developed pursuant to a funding agreement with the Illinois State Board of Education/Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education Research and Development Section, 100 North First Street, Springfield, Illinois 62777.
Opinions expressed in this publication do not reflect, nor should they be construed as policy or opinion of the State Board of Education or its staff.

PROJECT SUMMARY

DAVTE Funding Agreement Number: R-35-30-X-0423-106

Official Project Title (Phase III): Dissemination and Use of Materials to Facilitate Locally Directed Evaluation of Community College Agricultural Occupations Programs

Funded Agency: University of Illinois, Urbana Campus
Department of Vocational and Technical Education

Location: Urbana, Illinois 61801

Time Period Covered (Phase III): July 1, 1979 - June 30, 1980

Project Staff: Paul Hemp, Project Director
G. Donavon Coil, Principal Investigator
Laura Newman, Research Assistant
Charles Wanner, Research Assistant
Judy Flewelling, Secretary

Project Consultants: Larry Fischer, John Wood Community College
Max Foster, Illinois Central College
Louis Judson, Joliet Junior College
Stan Kosiba, Joliet Junior College
Timothy Van Hoveln, Lewis & Clark College

Field Test Coordinators: Robert Cottingham, Joliet Junior College
Max Foster, Illinois Central College
Bill Rich, Lake Land College
Timothy Van Hoveln, Lewis & Clark College

SECTION I

This section of the Guide includes the following:

1. Introduction
2. How Standards Benefit Students, Colleges, and the Community
3. How to Prepare for a Review of the Local Program
4. How to Conduct the Review
5. How to Develop a Plan for Upgrading the Local Program

INTRODUCTION

A preliminary list of standards for high quality vocational programs in agriculture at the secondary and postsecondary level was developed during a national seminar sponsored by the United States Office of Education and held in Kansas City, Missouri in March, 1976. A representative group of secondary and postsecondary instructors, state supervisors and teacher educators in agriculture participated in this seminar as a part of a long-range, national effort to upgrade vocational programs in agricultural occupations. The preliminary list of standards was refined, validated, printed, and disseminated at Iowa State University as a part of a national funded EPDA project. An instructional package designed to assist in the dissemination and implementation of the national standards was prepared and made available to each of the fifty states. The Illinois Joint Staff in Agricultural Education reviewed the standards and the implementation package and recommended that they be revised and adapted to the Illinois situation. A research proposal written by the Agricultural Education Division at the University of Illinois was funded by the Department of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education, Illinois Office of Education and was implemented in November, 1977 to adapt the national standards or prepare acceptable new standards for agricultural occupations programs in Illinois community colleges.

The dynamic nature of agriculture requires that periodic evaluations of established vocational education programs in agriculture be conducted. New and expanding programs need guides or models to follow to insure their proper development. The Illinois Standards for Quality Agricultural Occupations Programs in Community Colleges will provide some useful criteria for local program evaluation. The primary purpose of this guide is to assist local community college instructors, administrators, and other local persons in the evaluation

of the local program. Locally-directed evaluation efforts should be conducted by a team of professional educators and lay citizens. The results of such evaluations are intended for use in replanning and upgrading vocational agriculture programs and not as a basis for comparing one institution with another or for determining state or federal reimbursement.

A set of suggested general procedures for conducting a local review and evaluation of agriculture programs is included in the following pages of this report. These procedures have been derived from the recommendations set forth in the report of a nationally funded EPDA project conducted at Iowa State University plus valuable suggestions made by a project steering committee composed of ten community college instructors and administrators.

Recognizing that the review procedures to be used at the local level would vary with the situation, the project staff arranged for a field test of the suggested general procedures in four community colleges. The field tests were conducted in January and February, 1979 at Joliet Junior College, Illinois Central College, Lake Land College and Lewis and Clark College. Instructors conducting the field tests were encouraged to use variations in their review procedures so that possible new approaches could be identified and tested. Descriptions of the four field tests are included in Section III of this report.

HOW STANDARDS BENEFIT STUDENTS, COLLEGES AND THE COMMUNITY

The utilization of standards to evaluate and upgrade vocational education programs in agriculture should provide a variety of benefits. These benefits will affect not only students but also colleges, communities, and agricultural industries.

Benefits to Students

A. Instructional programs designed to meet student interests and needs.

B. Optimum classroom environment for students and instructors.

C. Planned and directed supervised internships and cooperative training programs which develop employment skills.

D Leadership activities designed to meet student interests and objectives.

E. Vocational guidance programs that assist the student in making realistic career choices.

F. Placement and follow-up information.

Benefits to College

A. Improved student morale.

B. More efficient use of instructional staff time.

C. More efficient use of facilities and equipment.

D. Improved school-community relations.

E. Better placement and follow-up.

F. Tool for evaluation of programs.

G. Recognition of a service provided by the school.

Benefits to Community College Districts

A. Greater employment among youth.

B. Youth better prepared to participate in community affairs.

C. An ongoing supply of qualified employees.

D. Reduced need for industry sponsored training programs.

E. Increased awareness of the opportunity in the agricultural education program.

F. Recognition of importance of agricultural industry.

G. Development of a greater spirit of cooperation in providing educational opportunities to the community.

HOW TO PREPARE FOR A REVIEW OF THE LOCAL PROGRAM

It is highly desirable that those chosen to evaluate the program have an interest in or responsibility for the agriculture program. With this in mind, the agriculture instructor, department chairperson, or program administrator should proceed with the following steps:

A. Obtain a complete set of the Illinois Standards for Quality Agricultural Occupations Programs in Community Colleges from the Head State Consultant in Agricultural Occupations. A listing of these standards and a checklist for using them is included in Section II of this report.

B. Use the program standards that apply to the programs which you are evaluating plus the "Standards Common to All."

C. Review and discuss standards with the proper authorities in order to proceed in an orderly manner with a review of the local program.

D. Organize and assemble a Program Review Committee

   1. Select committee members from the following groups:

      a. Agriculture advisory councils

      b. Local college administrators

      c. Agriculture students

      d. Agriculture alumni

      e. Agriculture instructor from a neighboring community college

      f. Parents of agriculture students

g. Personnel from agricultural businesses where students or former students are employed.

h. High school agriculture teachers

2. Limit the size of the Committee to approximately five members if one program is to be reviewed and seven to ten members if two or more programs are to be reviewed.

3. If several agriculture programs (horticulture, agricultural supply, agricultural production) are to be evaluated, a review committee should be formed for each program or specialists used in a subcommittee structure.

4. Orient the committee to its task:

   a. Purpose of the program review

   b. Role of the review committee

   c. Steps in conducting the review

   d. Role in development of a plan for upgrading the local program(s)

   e. Role in follow-up evaluation of progress

5. Provide review committee members with documents and materials which provide them with information needed to make valid judgments.

   Examples of materials which may be needed are as follows:

   a. Local one-year and five-year plan

   b. Course outlines

   c. Course catalog

   d. Reports of surveys and follow-up studies

e. Minutes of advisory council meetings

f. Budgets

g. Results of evaluations made by external groups

h. Program brochures and student handbooks

6. Arrange for resource persons such as administrators, instructional staff, students, and members of state advisory councils to be available for interview and consultation.

HOW TO CONDUCT THE REVIEW

The general procedures for conducting the review are as follows:

A. Assemble the review committee at the agriculture facility.

B. Review with the committee the role and function of the agriculture program(s) and the program objectives.

C. Using the Committee-as-a-Whole, consider each standard in the "Standards Common to All Programs" section and determine whether the local program "Exceeds", "Meets" or "Does not meet" the standard.

D. For each occupational program, use a subcommittee made up of technical specialists, instructors and administrators to do the rating.

E. Place a check in the appropriate column of the evaluation scale after a consensus has been reached. (See example)

F. Write a concise statement in the space marked "observations" citing factors which dictated the committee's decision.

G. The committee, upon completion of the program evaluation, should proceed to write "Recommendations" for each area of the agricultural program that failed to meet the criteria specified in the corresponding standards. (See example)

H. Compile a list of all "Recommendations" for improvements that are made as a result of the evaluation and arrange them in order of importance.

I. Share list of recommendations with the writer of the one-year and five-year plan to see which ones should be written into the college's local vocational plan.

HOW TO DEVELOP A PLAN FOR UPGRADING THE LOCAL PROGRAM

The general procedures for using recommendations to replan the local program are as follows:

A. Prioritize the list of recommendations using educational considerations, student health, and safety as major criteria (other criteria, e.g., cost, effectiveness, etc. to be determined by the committee.)

B. Share copies of the prioritized list or complete copies of the program review results with the following groups:

   1. Agricultural advisory council
   2. College board
   3. Administrators not involved in review
   4. Instructors not involved in review

C. Match resources with needs

   1. After joint consideration between administration and review committee, apply available resources where needed.
   2. In areas where local resources cannot be identified, the following action should be considered:
      a. Appoint special committees for further study of specific problems.
      b. Ask support groups to consider specific contributions toward upgrading the local vocational education program in agriculture.

Assistance may be obtained from the following:

(1) Agriculture Advisory Council

(2) Young Farmers' Associations

(3) Parents and Alumni Groups

(4) Agriculture Industry Sources

(5) IACCA Boosters' Club

D. File a final report of findings and recommendations with interested groups or agencies and follow dissemination procedures used by college.

1. College board
2. Advisory committee
3. Writer of local one-year and five-year plan

E. Develop a plan for periodic evaluation and follow-up to determine progress made toward upgrading the program.

SECTION II

This section of the Guide includes the following:

1. Reviewing the Local Programs - an example showing how to use the standards checklist

2. Lists of Standards Approved by Illinois Community College Instructors in Agriculture

    a. Standards Common to All Programs

    b. Standards Specific to Production Agriculture

    c. Standards Specific to Agricultural Supplies and Services

    d. Standards Specific to Agricultural Mechanics

    e. Standards Specific to Agricultural Products

    f. Standards Specific to Horticulture

    g. Standards Specific to Forestry

    h. Standards Specific to Adult Education

REVIEWING THE LOCAL PROGRAMS*

The following example is provided to help members of the review committee understand their task. The review committee working as a group should place a checkmark (✓) in the appropriate column of the evaluation scale after a consensus has been reached. In addition, observations and recommendations should be recorded in the spaces provided following each standard.

(Example)

Standard	Exceeds Stand.	Meets Stand.	Does Not Meet Stand.
The classroom, shops, and laboratory stations are adequate for the number of students enrolled. The equipment replicates that found in the occupations for which training is provided. Observations: Ag. Mech. shop is small and crowded. Need better ventilation system. Equipment and tools for tractor and machinery repair is inadequate. Recommendations: Increase shop size 30%. Install new ventilation system. Increase capital budget for shop equipment $1000 per year.			✓
A land laboratory, convenient to the school, is provided and utilized in the instructional program. Observations: Instructors use farm plots and school gardens for teaching purposes. Land lab is maintained in orderly fashion. Recommendations: None	✓		

* This material was adapted from "A Guide for Implementing Standards for Quality Vocational Programs in Agriculture/Agribusiness Education," Iowa State University, 1977.

Exceeds Stand.	Meets Stand.	Does Not Meet Stand.

STANDARDS COMMON TO ALL PROGRAMS

Instructional Program

1. The department's annual and five-year program plans, including goals, objectives, and activities, are on file in the department and with the administration.

   Observations:

   Recommendations:

2. A written statement of philosophy for vocational education in agricultural occupations is on file and is in harmony with the philosophy statement for the total school.

   Observations:

   Recommendations:

3. The instructional program is reviewed and modified in light of local, state, and federal manpower data.

   Observations:

   Recommendations:

4. Validated competencies, needed by students for entry and advancement in employment, are utilized in developing objectives for the instructional program.

   Observations:

   Recommendations:

	Exceeds Stand.	Meets Stand.	Does Not Meet Stand.
5. The instructional program contains the necessary balance of class time, laboratory work, field trips, and occupational experience to adequately prepare students for employment or advanced educational programs. Observations: Recommendations:			
6. Students enrolled in vocational education in agricultural occupations are also enrolled in other appropriate courses including science, mathematics, social science, and oral and written communications. Observations: Recommendations:			
7. The instructional program is articulated with other local secondary, postsecondary, and four-year programs of education in agricultural occupations. Observations: Recommendations:			
8. Planned visits are made to prospective employers by the agricultural occupations instructor or school placement officer to determine current manpower needs. Observations: Recommendations:			

	Exceeds Stand.	Meets Stand.	Does Not Meet Stand.
9. Written courses of study are based on validated competencies and are evaluated and revised annually. Observations: Recommendations:			
10. Provisions are made to accomodate students with physical handicaps or other special educational needs. Observations: Recommendations:			
11. Community resources, facilities, and industries are identified and utilized to enhance the quality of the instructional program. Observations: Recommendations:			
12. Course syllabi are developed that clearly state instructional objectives, activities, and resources to be utilized during instruction. Observations: Recommendations:			

	Exceeds Stand.	Meets Stand.	Does Not Meet Stand.
13. Modern and technically accurate instructional materials and textbooks are utilized in the instructional program.			
Observations:			
Recommendations:			
14. Students have access to current trade journals and other agricultural publications.			
Observations:			
Recommendations:			
15. Instruction in safety is provided in advance of any shop or laboratory work.			
Observations:			
Recommendations:			
Supervised Occupational Experience			
16. A systematic plan is utilized to select, develop, and evaluate training stations that assist students in obtaining desired occupational competencies.			
Observations:			
Recommendations:			

Exceeds Stand.	Meets Stand.	Does Not Meet Stand.

17. The instructor, student, and employer cooperatively develop a formal training agreement and training plan which include essential competencies and experiences that are to be acquired during the program.

    Observations:

    Recommendations:

18. Students participating in the occupational experience program are employed in accordance with all applicable federal and state labor laws.

    Observations:

    Recommendations:

19. The instructor provides effective coordination, supervision, and occupational guidance to students engaged in occupational experience programs.

    Observations:

    Recommendations:

20. Supervision of students, engaged in cooperative occupational experience programs, is accomplished by both the instructor and the cooperating employer.

    Observations:

    Recommendations:

	Exceeds Stand.	Meets Stand.	Does Not Meet Stand.
21. Each instructor responsible for supervision of occupational experience programs maintains adequate records to determine student progress and to assist in placement. Observations: Recommendations:			
22. Students receive (school) credit for all supervised occupational employment programs that are conducted during regular school hours. Observations: Recommendations:			
23. Students are engaged in supervised occupational experience programs that are related to their occupational objective and are appropriate in light of their ability. Observations: Recommendations:			
24. Each student engaged in a supervised occupational experience program maintains accurate and up-to-date records including the competencies acquired during the program. Observations: Recommendations:			

	Exceeds Stand.	Meets Stand.	Does Not Meet Stand.

Leadership Development

25. Leadership development activities are an integral part of the instructional program.

    Observations:

    Recommendations:

26. All postsecondary agricultural occupations students are encouraged to participate in student organizations.

    Observations:

    Recommendations:

Student Recruitment, Enrollment, and Advisement

27. The agricultural occupations instructor advises each student on a regular basis and assists those with special educational needs to obtain additional assistance from qualified school personnel.

    Observations:

    Recommendations:

28. A student file is maintained for all students and contains information on occupational objectives, supervised occupational experience programs, leadership activities, completed course work, and other necessary information.

    Observations:

    Recommendations:

	Exceeds Stand.	Meets Stand.	Does Not Meet Stand.
29. Prospective students and their parents are encouraged to visit the agriculture department and are provided copies of the program information prior to their enrollment.			
Observations:			
Recommendations:			
30. Enrollment policies permit flexible entry and exit from the agricultural occupations program.			
Observations:			
Recommendations:			
Public Relations			
31. Through an effective public relations program, the faculty, students, parents, employers, advisory council members, and the community understand the educational objectives, major activities and accomplishments of the agricultural occupations program.			
Observations:			
Recommendations:			
32. The instructors establish and maintain cooperative working relations with leaders in related industries, organizations, and agencies.			
Observations:			
Recommendations:			

Exceeds Stand.	Meets Stand.	Does Not Meet Stand.

Facilities and Equipment

33. The classrooms, shops, and laboratory stations are adequate for the number of students enrolled. The equipment replicates that found in the occupations for which training is provided.

    Observations:

    Recommendations:

34. Facilities and equipment meet all current state and federal safety regulations.

    Observations:

    Recommendations:

35. The classroom and laboratory are maintained in an orderly, safe, and attractive condition.

    Observations:

    Recommendations:

36. Facilities and equipment are arranged with consideration given to effective teaching, class control, safety, and economy.

    Observations:

    Recommendations:

Exceeds Stand.	Meets Stand.	Does Not Meet Stand.

37. The departmental office is located so as to provide optimum supervision of activities.

    Observations:

    Recommendations:

38. Supplies and equipment are stored in a systematic and safe manner.

    Observations:

    Recommendations:

39. Maintenance and service records of equipment are on file in the department.

    Observations:

    Recommendations:

Staffing

40. The instructor possesses the personal, technical, professional and occupational competencies necessary to prepare students for entry level employment or for advanced educational programs.

    Observations:

    Recommendations:

	Exceeds Stand.	Meets Stand.	Does Not Meet Stand.
41. The instructor is sensitive to the needs of students and can recognize and make provisions for individual student differences within the instructional program. Observations: Recommendations:			
42. The instructor is actively involved in professional teacher organizations which are supported by agricultural educators in the state, and is engaged in continuing in-service professional development programs. Observations: Recommendations:			
43. The department has access to adequate secretarial services. Observations: Recommendations:			
44. When part-time instruction reaches 36 semester hours per year within a given program, an additional full-time instructor will be employed. Observations: Recommendations:			

Exceeds Stand.	Meets Stand.	Does Not Meet Stand.

45. Instructors are employed on contracts to provide for continuous education and supervision of students during summer months.

Observations:

Recommendations:

Administration and Supervision

46. The agricultural occupations program is an integral part of the local district plan for vocational education.

Observations:

Recommendations:

47. Representatives of local, area, and state education agencies participate in planning the program of instruction and are kept informed of the progress made.

Observations:

Recommendations:

48. In multiple-instructor departments, one instructor is appointed and compensated to serve as department head. Job descriptions are on file for all department staff members.

Observations:

Recommendations:

Exceeds Stand.	Meets Stand.	Does Not Meet Stand.

49. The advisory council functions under written guidelines which specify the length of a member's term, responsibilities, and operational procedures.

    Observations:

    Recommendations:

50. An agricultural occupations advisory council or committee is formed and meets to help determine program needs and to assist in promotion and evaluation of the program.

    Observations:

    Recommendations:

Exceeds Stand.	Meets Stand.	Does Not Meet Stand.

Finance

51-58) The instructional program is supported by an annual board-approved budget that considers program needs and the number of students enrolled. Included are:

51. Staff compensation on an annual basis
52. Staff compensation for duties performed beyond the standard teaching day.
53. Facility operation and maintenance
54. Equipment and material purchase and replacement
55. Consumable supplies
56. Teacher travel and per diem
57. Transportation for field trips
58. In-service education

Observations:

Recommendations:

59. Appropriate and accurate financial records are maintained. Administration and/or board-approved policies are provided for the receipt and disbursement of funds.

Observations:

Recommendations:

	Exceeds Stand.	Meets Stand.	Does Not Meet Stand.
Placement			
60. The instructor, in cooperation with the school guidance counselor, assists in the placement and follow-up of students. A file of placement and employment records is maintained.			
Observations:			
Recommendations:			
Evaluation			
61. The instructor, local administrator(s), and appropriate state education agency staff member(s) meet at regular intervals to formally examine and evaluate the agricultural occupations program.			
Observations:			
Recommendations:			
62. One and five-year follow-up surveys of former students are made to determine their current occupational or educational status.			
Observations:			
Recommendations:			
63. Results obtained from program evaluations are used to promote, develop, and improve the instructional program.			
Observations:			
Recommendations:			

	Exceeds Stand.	Meets Stand.	Does Not Meet Stand.

STANDARDS SPECIFIC TO PRODUCTION AGRICULTURE

Instructional Programs

64. Instructors employed during the summer months submit to the administration a program of responsibilities to be assumed during the summer months.

Observations:

Recommendations:

Supervised Occupational Experience

65. An annual report of the occupational experience program of students is to be kept on file by the local agriculture department.

Observations:

Recommendations:

Staffing

66. It is highly desirable that the instructors have a degree in agriculture and satisfactory experience in the occupational area in which they teach.

Observations:

Recommendations:

67. A full-time load should be 16-24 students for instructors doing on-job supervision.

Observations:

Recommendations:

	Exceeds Stand.	Meets Stand.	Does Not Meet Stand.
(68-70) The desirable student teacher ratios do not exceed:			
68. 30 to 1 in classroom instruction			
69. 15 to 1 in laboratory			
70. 30 to 1 in providing advising functions			
Observations:			
Recommendations:			
Administration and Supervision			
71. The postsecondary production agriculture education program is an integral segment of the institution's plan for Vocational Education designed for students who need and can profit from it.			
Observations:			
Recommendations:			
72. An agricultural production program should have an active advisory council.			
Observations:			
Recommendations:			

	Exceeds Stand.	Meets Stand.	Does Not Meet Stand.

STANDARDS SPECIFIC TO AGRICULTURAL SUPPLIES AND SERVICES

Instructional Programs

73. The postsecondary instructional program is two years in length.

Observations:

Recommendations:

74. The instructional program excluding S.O.E. allocates 25-45% to laboratory activities and experiences.

Observations:

Recommendations:

Supervised Occupational Experience

75. Students are visited at least monthly by the instructor.

Observations:

Recommendations:

76. Wages are paid to the student during a supervised occupational experience training program.

Observations:

Recommendations:

Exceeds Stand.	Meets Stand.	Does Not Meet Stand.

77. A full-time instructor supervises 16-24 students while they are engaged in an occupational experience program.

Observations:

Recommendations:

78. Supervised occupational experience involves a range of 8-27 weeks of full-time employment within the two-year program.

Observations:

Recommendations:

Student Recruitment, Enrollment, and Counseling

79. Working relationships exist between the agricultural supplies and services faculty and the student services personnel in the school system.

Observations:

Recommendations:

80. Students are advised concerning the interests, attitudes and physical requirements, and other qualifications essential to successful entry and employment in agricultural supplies and services.

Observations:

Recommendations:

Exceeds Stand.	Meets Stand.	Does Not Meet Stand.

81. An aggressive program of recruitment and selection should be conducted.

Observations:

Recommendations:

Facilities and Equipment

82. Office space is provided for each instructor.

Observations:

Recommendation:

Staffing

(83-85) The desirable student/instructor ratios do not exceed:

83. 30:1 in classroom instruction
84. 15:1 in laboratory
85. 30:1 providing advisement functions

Observations:

Recommendations:

	Exceeds Stand.	Meets Stand.	Does Not Meet Stand.
86. Student/full-time instructor ratio does not exceed 20:1.			
87. Full-time instructors have a B.S. degree in agriculture and have satisfactory employment experiences in the agricultural supply and service area.			
88. Instructors participate in professional improvement activities.			
89. Periodic reports of activities and accomplishments are submitted.			

Observations:

Recommendations:

Observations:

Recommendations:

Observations:

Recommendations:

Administration and Supervision

Observations:

Recommendations:

Exceeds Stand.	Meets Stand.	Does Not Meet Stand.

90. An agricultural supply and service program should have an active advisory council.

Observations:

Recommendations:

Exceeds Stand.	Meets Stand.	Does Not Meet Stand.

STANDARDS SPECIFIC TO AGRICULTURAL MECHANICS

Supervised Occupational Experience

91. Each student completes a minimum of 450 hours of supervised occupational experience per year in the agricultural mechanics area for which they are being trained.

    Observations:

    Recommendations:

Facilities and Equipment

92. The facilities in agricultural mechanics are designed and used only for agricultural mechanics instruction.

    Observations:

    Recommendations:

93. The facilities include a self-contained unit, which houses classrooms, laboratories, offices, storage, and complimentary auxiliary features.

    Observations:

    Recommendations:

94. Adequate student lockers, restrooms and clean-up facilities are provided.

    Observations:

    Recommendations:

Exceeds Stand.	Meets Stand.	Does Not Meet Stand.

95. Main entrance to the agricultural mechanics laboratory is a minimum of 14 feet high and 16 feet wide.

    Observations:

    Recommendations:

96. Adequate lighting and ventilation are provided.

    Observations:

    Recommendations:

97. The classroom has a minimum width of 28 feet and provides 40 square feet of space per student (maximum 32 students) and 120 square feet of storage space.

    Observations:

    Recommendations:

98. Adequate space is provided for a library, lockers, and outside storage.

    Observations:

    Recommendations:

	Exceeds Stand.	Meets Stand.	Does Not Meet Stand.
99. Tools and equipment are modern and comparable with those in farming and industry.			
Observations:			
Recommendations:			
00-106) Components, tools, and equipment to safely and properly analyze and service the following systems are available for instruction:			
100. Fuel systems			
101. Hydraulics			
102. Engines			
103. Power trains			
104. Heating and air conditioning			
105. Machinery			
106. Electrical			
Observations:			
Recommendations:			

	Exceeds Stand.	Meets Stand.	Does Not Meet Stand.
107. Equipment is available to meet instructional needs in electric power and processing, structures and environment, soil and water, and in construction and maintenance if these instructional areas are offered. Observations: Recommendations:			
108. The farm power technology training area has a minimum width of 50 feet and a width-length ratio of 1 to 2 permitting an open concept instructional area and flexible use. Observations: Recommendations:			
109. A minimum of one laboratory and storage area is provided for each of the instructional areas. Instructional areas defined as farm power technology, diesel technology, hydraulics, farmstead electrification, soil and water conservation, farm structures, welding, etc. Observations: Recommendations:			

	Exceeds Stand.	Meets Stand.	Does Not Meet Stand.
0-115) Recommended minimum space is available for special work areas as follows:			
110. Air Conditioning - 50 sq. ft./student			
111. Power and Machinery - 400 sq. ft./student			
112. Hydraulics - 50 sq. ft./student			
113. Diesel - 50 sq. ft./student			
114. Electrical - 50 sq.ft./student			
115. Tool and equipment storage - 1,000 sq. ft. total			
Observations:			
Recommendations:			
Staffing			
116. Each instructor has a minimum of one hour each day for preparation, one hour for counseling, and one hour for supervision.			
Observations:			
Recommendations:			
117. Each instructor teaches not more thar four different subjects per day.			
Observations:			
Recommendations:			

Exceeds Stand.	Meets Stand.	Does Not Meet Stand.

118. Each agricultural mechanics instructor is limited to 22 contact hours per week.

Observations:

Recommendations:

119. Postsecondary instructors have a minimum of a A.A.S. degree plus three years of experience, or a B.S. degree in Ag. Mechanics, or a B.S. degree in Ag. Education, or eight years of experience.

Observations:

Recommendations:

120. The agricultural mechanics program director or head has a minimum of a B.S. degree in agriculture, and a minimum of two years experience teaching agricultural mechanics.

Observations:

Recommendations:

121. The maximum number of students in classroom instruction is 28; in laboratory/shop activities the maximum is 14.

Observations:

Recommendations:

STANDARDS SPECIFIC TO AGRICULTURAL PRODUCTS	Exceeds Stand.	Meets Stand.	Does Not Meet Stand.
Instructional Program			
124. The program of study is based upon approved agricultural products curriculum guides adapted to meet the needs of enrolled students.			
Observations:			
Recommendations:			
125. Students are engaged in related supervised occupational experience beyond normal classroom and laboratory instruction. They receive experience and credit when placed for occupational experience, or participate in school-provided facilities.			
Observations:			
Recommendations:			
126. The instructional program excluding Supervised Occupational Experience allocates 25-45% to laboratory activities and experiences.			
Observations:			
Recommendations:			

	Exceeds Stand.	Meets Stand.	Does Not Meet Stand.
Student Recruitment and Enrollment			
127. An aggressive program of recruitment and selection is conducted. Observations: Recommendations:			
128. Students are advised concerning the interests, attitudes, physical requirements, and other qualifications essential to successful entry and employment in agricultural products. Observations: Recommendations:			
Facilities and Equipment			
129. Large and easily accessible storage facilities of sufficient size to accommodate equipment and materials used in agricultural products processing are provided. Observations: Recommendations:			
130. Facilities and equipment meet local, state, and federal regulations. Observations: Recommendations:			

Exceeds Stand.	Meets Stand.	Does Not Meet Stand.

131. The classroom and laboratory are orderly and attractive, and provide students an example of good industry housekeeping.

Observations:

Recommendations:

132. Adequate, modern laboratory equipment will be provided to meet instructional needs.

Observations:

Recommendations:

Staffing

133. Student/full-time instructor ratio does not exceed 20:1

Observations:

Recommendations:

134. Full-time instructors have a B.S. degree in agriculture and have satisfactory employment experience in the Ag. Products area.

Observations:

Recommendations:

	Exceeds Stand.	Meets Stand.	Does Not Meet Stand.
135. An agricultural products program shall have an active advisory council.			

STANDARDS SPECIFIC TO HORTICULTURE	Exceeds Stand.	Meets Stand.	Does Not Meet Stand.
Instructional Programs			
136. Community resources, facilities, and industry have been identified and are utilized in an attempt to enrich the learning experience of the students. Observations: Recommendations:			
137. A minimum of 1,000 hours are devoted to postsecondary instruction and laboratory and cooperative on-the-job experience. Observations: Recommendations:			
138. The complete program in horticulture includes technical horticulture, horticultural mechanics, supervised occupational experience, laboratory experience, leadership training, and occupational guidance. Technical horticulture includes flower shop management, greenhouse management, turf management, garden center management, arboriculture, nursery management, including construction, installation, maintenance, design, park management, vegetable production, fruit science (pomology), and apiculture.			
Leadership Development			
139. The instructors of the ornamental horticulture program also serve as advisors to the vocational student organization that provides leadership training for students enrolled in the program. Observations: Recommendations:			

Exceeds Stand.	Meets Stand.	Does Not Meet Stand.

Facilities and Equipment

(140-146) The following horticulture facilities, conforming to state standards, are available for use in the specialized instructional programs:

140. Head house and work area (600 sq. ft. total)
141. Walk-in cooler
142. Storage area
143. Classroom
144. Instructor's office
145. Horticulture mechanics laboratory
146. Restrooms, shower, and locker rooms

Observations:

Recommendations:

147. Equipment is commensurate with state horticultural industry standards and instructional objectives.

Observations:

Recommendations:

148. An adequate ornamental horticulture library is maintained and kept current.

Observations:

Recommendations:

Exceeds Stand.	Meets Stand.	Does Not Meet Stand.

149. The following ornamental horticulture facilities, conforming to state standards, are available for use in the specialized instructional program:

A minimum greenhouse of 1800 sq. ft. is necessary for horticulture programs using greenhouse space. Seventy sq. ft. per FTE student is recommended.

Observations:

Recommendations:

Staffing

150. Twenty regular students, or 10 special needs students represent the maximum enrollment in classroom/laboratory classes.

Observations:

Recommendations:

Exceeds Stand.	Meets Stand.	Does Not Meet Stand.

151-153) Time and finances are provided for instructors to upgrade their professional and technical skills through:

151. five annual visits to other ornamental horticulture departments, or to trade/technical conferences.

152. attendance at state technical education or state education agency conferences

153. subscriptions to journals in each area of specialization.

Observations:

Recommendations:

154. Horticulture instructors must meet minimum education certification and have twenty (20) semester hours in horticulture and/or one and one-half (1½) years of related work experience.

Observations:

Recommendations:

Exceeds Stand.	Meets Stand.	Does Not Meet Stand.

STANDARDS SPECIFIC TO FORESTRY

Instructional Program

155. The program provides for 800 contact hours of instruction in forestry courses, two-thirds of which are devoted to field instruction.

Observations:

Recommendations:

(156-162) The 800 contact hours of instruction are distributed among subject matter areas in approximately the following manner:

	Contact Hours	Subject Matter
156.	110	Land Surveying
157.	20	Woods Safety
158.	30	Forestry Equipment
159.	110	Harvesting Techniques and Utilization
160.	50	Forest Land Use and Development
161.	50	Forest Management Practices
162.	20	Firemanship

Observations:

Recommendations:

Exceeds Stand	Meets Stand.	Does Not Meet Stand.

Student Recruitment, Enrollment, and Advisement

163. Students in postsecondary programs have high school diplomas or the equivalent.

Observations:

Recommendations:

Facilities and Equipment

164. A sufficient outdoor laboratory or school forest is to be provided. The location should be readily accessible to students during regular class time.

Observations:

Recommendations:

(165-166)An agricultural mechanics laboratory is provided which:

165. meets the mimimum standards for space utilized for furnishings, equipment and instruction

166. allows for maintenance and storage of tools and equipment of the type simulating that used in the forestry industry.

Observations:

Recommendations:

STANDARDS SPECIFIC TO ADULT EDUCATION

Exceeds Stand.	Meets Stand.	Does Not Meet Stand.

167. Agricultural programs will include adult education as an integral part of the existing programs as defined by the Illinois Community College Act.

Observations:

Recommendations:

SECTION III

This section of the Guide includes the following field test reports:

1. Horticulture program - Joliet Junior College
2. Agricultural Supply Program - Illinois Central College
3. Agricultural Mechanics Program - Lake Land College
4. Agricultural Production Program - Lewis & Clark College

RESULTS OF FIELD TESTS CONDUCTED AT FOUR ILLINOIS COMMUNITY COLLEGES

The research project staff prepared a set of suggested general procedures for community colleges to follow in conducting local program evaluations. This set of procedures was considered to be a tentative approach to the use of the program standards since it had not been subjected to field testing at the local level. The project steering committee recommended that field testing of the suggested procedures be carried out and that the instructors in charge of the field tests be encouraged to explore alternative procedures and to test out variations which were believed to have merit. Four agriculture instructors agreed to conduct field tests as follows:

Robert Cottingham - Joliet Junior College - Horticulture

Max Foster - Illinois Central College - Agricultural Supplies

Bill Rich - Lake Land College - Agricultural Mechanics

Tim Van Hoveln - Lewis & Clark College - Agricultural Production

Each instructor was to conduct a local program review using a review committee and the standards pertaining to the program assigned and the standards designated as "Common to All Programs." The instructors engaged in the field testing exercises were asked to present oral reports at the regional workshops conducted for Illinois community college agricultural instructors and to prepare a short written report of their field test activities. The four field test reports are included in this section of the guide.

Community college personnel who plan to conduct local program reviews are urged to take advantage of what has been learned in the field test sites in designing their own review process. Using the set of general procedures in Section I of this report and the results of the field tests, instructors and administrators should be able to fashion a plan which will be appropriate for the local situation.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE STANDARDS PROJECT
FIELD TEST REPORT

Area I--Joliet Junior College
Pilot Teacher--Robert Cottingham
Standards Tested--Standards Common to all Programs
Horticulture

The quality standards for agriculture programs approved by the Illinois Association of Community College Agriculture Instructors were used by two separate groups at Joliet Junior College to evaluate the horticulture program. The first evaluation was done by a "local" group on January 4, 1979; the second evaluation by a team of educational professionals who came to Joliet on January 8, 1979.

The local team was made up of two members of the Joliet Junior College Horticulture Advisory Council, the Department Chairman of the Biology Department at Joliet Junior College, and the Agriculture Business Program Coordinator at Joliet. One of the advisory council members has served on the council since the beginning of the horticulture program and is the co-owner and operator of a greenhouse-flower shop. The other advisory council member had been on the council for three years, is a former student from Joliet Junior College, and is superintendent of a golf course. The input from the Biology Department Chairman was quite limited inasmuch as he was involved in another meeting for the majority of the morning. The Agriculture Business Coordinator assumed the role of team leader for the evaluation.

The professional evaluation team was composed of a staff member from the Division of Adult, Vocational and Technical Education, the Agriculture Department Chairman of a junior college department that has a horticulture

program, and a horticulture instructor from another junior college in Illinois. The president of the Illinois Association of Community College Agriculture Instructors was consulted on the selection of the three members of the professional evaluation team.

In preparation for both evaluations, a packet was assembled to provide information to the evaluators on the extent to which the program met the "standards common to all programs" and the "standards specific to horticulture programs". Attached is a list of the information presented to the evaluators, indicating the standard, by number, to which the data were to apply. Both teams felt that the information packet was indispensable, and it would be recommended that materials of this type be assembled whenever the quality standards are used for evaluation.

Also in preparation for the evaluations, the following time plan was projected for both evaluations by the pilot teacher.

8:00	Coffee and conversation
8:30	Evaluation
12:30	Lunch
1:15	Complete review-observations and recommendations
2:30	Meet with staff to present results
3:30	Adjourn

This, however, was not the way in which either of the evaluations progressed. Perhaps, because of the expertise of the evaluators and their awareness of the situation, the following procedures were used and should be recommended:

a. Coffee
b. Tour of the facilities
c. Evaluation
d. Lunch
e. Continued evaluation
f. Summary meeting with staff

At the beginning of evaluation time, the pilot teacher was involved for approximately one-half hour to initiate and answer questions on the evaluation. It became evident that time beyond this would be counter-productive. From time to time during the evaluation, pilot teacher checked with the evaluators and answered questions on specific standards. In both evaluations, group members worked together on all of the standards rather than assigning specific standards to individuals and then coming back together to formulate observations and recommendations. All observations and recommendations were arrived at by the team as a whole.

In the summary session with the horticulture staff:

> Both teams mentioned the following standards: 4, 5, 9, 21, 33, 62, 136. They agreed in their observations on numbers 9, 21, and 62. They disagreed in their observations of numbers 5, and 33. Mentioned only by the local group were standards numbered 11, 14, 16, 17, 32, 40, 43, 45, 50, 51-58, 137, 139, 149, and 154. Mentioned only by the professional educators were standards numbered 10, 15, 48, 140-146.

On the written report, the local evaluation group made specific recommendations on eighteen of the 72 standards. The professional educators made specific recommendations on 12 of the 72 standards. Recommendations were made by both evaluation teams on standards numbered 4, 5, and 62. In addition, the local evaluators commented on standard number 167 concerning adult education.

The results of both of these program surveys were used with a Horticulture Advisory Council meeting held at Joliet on January 10, 1979. Consideration of the evaluation results lead to specific recommendations being made by the advisory council, and to changes in the one-and five-year plan for the horticulture program.

Following the summary session with staff, the usefulness of the standards in evaluating programs was discussed with both groups of evaluators. The local group suggested that standard number 9 be made to read "evaluated and/or revised annually," feeling that annual revision of course outlines might not be necessary or productive. A similar concern was brought out by the professional educators.

The local group suggested that perhaps there should be standards concerning retention of students and the recruitment of students.

The team of professional educators made the following comments on standards:

No. 7 - Some explanation of the system of "articulation" may be needed.

No. 25 - The use of the word "integral" was questioned. It was suggested that the word "instructional" be removed from the standard.

No. 25 & 26 - The measurability of these standards was questioned, and this promoted a discussion on the measurability of all of the standards.

No. 148 - The word "adequate" needs definition.

It appeared that the disagreement on Standard Number 5 resulted from the fact that the professional educators looked at individual courses in making their recommendation, while the local team based their recommendation on the timing of the on-job-training periods. The differences in comments and recommendations on Standard Number 33 resulted from the concern of the professional group for the needs of the handicapped.

Recommendations of the pilot teacher:

The standards would be used frequently by local groups to provide input to the advisory council for program improvement.

The programs should be evaluated periodically by a professional group sanctioned by the professional association of the community college agriculture teachers.

The results of the local evaluation and professional evaluations should be used to update the one-and five-year plans for specific programs and departments.

Comments about the standards should be forwarded to appropriate Statewide Advisory Councils and/or the Executive committee of the Illinois Association of Community College Agriculture Instructors, and specific recommendations should be acted upon by the Association membership.

Evaluations of this size should not require more than one day to complete.

The numbers of members of the team should be kept at a minimum in order to facilitate completion of the evaluation in a minimum amount of time; however, in order to achieve quality of evaluation, representation of various agencies, backgrounds, experience, and points of view of team members should outweigh time and group size limitations.

STD #	Item
1	One- and Five- Year Plan
2	Philosophy for Vocational Education in Agriculture-See Catalog
3.	Advisory Council minutes
4	
5	Program Brochures
6	
7	Articulated Courses IACCAI - Capston Information
8	
9	Course Outlines
10	
11	List of Field trips & Training Stations List
12	(see item 9)
13	Text Book List - Publications List
14	List of Publications Received
15	
16	"Employer Files"
17	Training Agreements
18	
19	
20	O-J-T Project
21	Weekly O-J-T reports
22	
23	
24	
25	SAA & SHA
26	
27	
28	Example Advisee File
29	Open House program
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	Inventory (Bob Glenn's office)
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	Instructor Loads

STD #	Item
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	Advisory Council Handbook
50	
51-59	Budget
60	Student Summaries
61	
62	(see #60)
63	(see #3)
136	
137	Program Brochure
138	(see #137)
139	
140-146	
147	
148	
149	
150	Fall & Spring Schedules
151-153	Budget & Summary of Instructor Meetings
154	

COMMUNITY COLLEGE STANDARDS PROJECT
FIELD TEST REPORT

Area II--Illinois Central College
Pilot Teacher--Max Foster
Standards Tested--Standards Common to all Programs
Agricultural Supplies and Services

Committee Make-up:

1. Professional from another junior college
2. Cooperator in SOE
3. Businessman
4. Former student
5. Consultant
6. Local staff member

Agenda for the Days Activities:

8:30- 9:00 Introductions, objectives

9:00- 9:30 Tour of facilities including Learning Resources Center

9:30-10:00 Presentation of support materials

10:00-11:30 Standards evaluation

11:30-12:30 Lunch and fee time

12:30- 2:30 Standards evaluation and recommendations*

2:30- 3:00 Report to the staff

*Recommendations should be formulated as the committee proceeds through the standards.

Listing of Support Materials:

1. Course syllabus
2. Advisory council minutes
3. Placement materials, ie: training agreement, report outline, weekly reports, training plans, evaluations instruments.
4. Course outlines
5. Course objective and/or competencies

6. Follow-up students 1 and 5 year
7. Student records or an outline of our system
8. Catalog copy and program brochures
9. List of textbook and reference materials
10. Departmental budgets
11. Copies of 1 and 5 year plan
12. Copy of student reports on placement
13. Copy of the evaluation instrument used

Observations on procedures:

1. Would be beneficial to have a current student on committee.
2. Committee members had a problem with what to compare with (no Standard available).
3. Committee indicated a faculty member in an other area could be helpful.
4. A list of questions to use when interviewing students would be helpful. (See Standard 13, 14, & 15.)
5. Prepare a list of items that should be checked on the tour, ie: lab equipment, references in the library, periodicals.
6. Visit with a librarian.
7. Go through the material for a period of time and then take tour.
8. Send out support materials ahead of time.

COMMUNITY COLLEGE STANDARDS PROJECT
FIELD TEST REPORT

Area III--Lake Land College
Pilot Teachers--Bill Rich and Tom Reedy
Standards Tested--Standards Common to all Programs
Agriculture Mechanics

Lake Land College located at Mattoon, Illinois was selected as a site to field test standards for Agriculture Mechanics. The local program review was conducted during January and February 1979.

Local Program Review Procedure

1. The Agriculture staff at Lake Land College met as a staff to review the checklist. Assignments were given to collect data as required by the review form. Example: entrance door height and width, square feet in the classroom, class size.
2. The Local Program Review was placed on the agenda for the January 1979 Agriculture Mechanics Advisory Council meeting. The purpose of the Illinois Standards project was reviewed by the council and a plan of action developed.
3. A local program review committee was selected by the council to review the standards relevant to the Agriculture Mechanics Program at Lake Land College and to complete the checklist.
4. The review committee met for an afternoon on campus to view the facilities and complete the check list.
5. The review committee will be on the agenda at the next Agriculture Mechanics Advisory Council meeting to report on committee findings.
6. Following acceptance of the report by the Agriculture Mechanics Advisory Council it will be forwarded to the appropriate college administrator with recommendations in areas that are deficient.

Review Committee Make-Up

Bud Overbeck, Lake Land College Mechanics Instructor

Tom Reedy, Chairman of Agriculture Division at Lake Land College

Dwight Schilling, owner of Schilling John Deere Dealership and training station cooperator.

Bob Corley, owner of Corley International Harvestor Dealership and training station cooperator.

Bruce Elliott, Agriculture Mechanics student at Lake Land College

Dale Puyear, Agriculture Mechanics student at Lake Land College

Ed Dunphy, Instructor at Lake Land College in Agriculture Business

Supportive Materials

-College catalog

-Division budget

-One-and five-year plan

-Course syllabus

-Training agreement

-Placement data

-Enrollment data

-Staff qualifications

Observations of Review Committee:

1. The local review process is beneficial to help keep programs relevant and meaningful.
2. Local program review is an excellent public relations vehicle to secure community involvement.
3. The checklist seems appropriate as a basis for program review.
4. Staff members and others engaged in the review process must be realistic and realize that some changes needed may never come about

or at least be slow in coming because of budget, attitudes, or other reasons.

5. Colleges should use local people for program review but keep in mind the Agriculture Mechanics program in the Community College should be a leader in the field and not always playing "catch-up".

COMMUNITY COLLEGE STANDARDS PROJECT
FIELD TEST REPORT

Area IV--Lewis and Clark Community College
Pilot Teacher--Timothy Van Hoveln
Standards Tested--Standards Common to All Programs
Agricultural Production

The Agricultural Science Department field tested the approved Standards for Quality Education utilizing the recommended checklist instrument and suggested procedures on February 5, 1979. A total of two and one-half hours was spent on this exercise.

The Evaluation Team

The evaluation team consisted of individuals from the Lewis and Clark district and were knowledgeable of the college and/or agriculture program. Potential members were contacted individually and given a brief explanation of the exercise. Those individuals accepting the invitation to participate were:

a. Dr. Peter Chacharonis - Chairman of the Health & Life Sciences Division, Lewis and Clark Community College. The Agricultural Science Department is part of this Division.

b. Dr. Albert K. Van Walleghen, D.V.M. - Veterinarian and past-President of the Lewis and Clark Board of Trustees. He has been a trustee since the conception of the College.

c. Mr. James Seibert - Chairman of the Lewis and Clark Agricultural Advisory Committee. He also is an agricultural loan officer for Jersey State Bank.

d. Mr. Michael Weber - a 1975 graduate of the Agricultural Science program at Lewis and Clark. He presently is employed as an insurance agent for Country Companies.

Each member was provided with the instrument for the evaluation and given explicit instructions. The following three questions were emphasized:

a. Does the instrument provide sufficient opportunity to evaluate the program? Will it provide ample information to the institution involved?

b. What individuals should serve on the evaluation team?

c. What sources of information should be provided to the evaluation team for standard clarification? Who? What? When?

The following observations and recommendations were made during this exercise:

The Instrument

General Observations:

"Some standards are "canned" questions in many areas, not only on physical facilities."

"Had trouble with some terminology, but after discussing them, they became relevant."

"The team should (must) have access to instrument prior to any formal meeting."

"Some redundancy in questions."

"How can one exceed state-federal mandates or laws? Like in Number 1, 10, 18, 34, and 46?"

"Idea of observations and recommendations is good. Most evaluations are set up this way."

"In Number 36, what is a proper arrangement?"

Recommendation:

In a total perspective, the instrument works. It provides adequate opportunity to evaluate the program.

The Evaluation Team

General Observations:

"I think you did a good job in selection. You have a faculty perspective, division perspective, advisory perspective, a board perspective, and a student perspective."

"This group provides variety. All of us have different ideas on various aspects of the program."

"Outsiders? Definitely not! If I didn't know anything about the program and were asked to evaluate it, I'd be lost. I'd feel out of place."

"The student perspective should be a past graduate. At least two years out of school or more."

"You might have included a S.O.E. coordinator or trainer. many questions pertained to this area."

"I think a S.O.E. coordinator would have been very beneficial."

"A high School Ag. teacher may fit in. Especially in the areas of articulation and public relations."

Recommendation:

The evaluation team should include perspectives from the following:

a. Agriculture faculty
b. Division Chairman
c. Advisory Committee
d. Student (graduate)
e. Board
f. S.O.E. Trainer
g. High School Ag. teacher

Sources of Information

General Observations:

None

Recommendations:

1. Student evaluations of courses and programs.
2. Student files, especially S.O.E.
3. One- and five-year follow-up surveys of graduates.
4. Tour of facilities.
5. Departmental budget.
6. Audit sheets of monthly dispersements.
7. One- and five-year plans.
8. R.A.M.P. document.
9. Faculty member in agriculture.